

From: [REDACTED]  
To: Enck, Judith  
Subject: Fwd: Congratulations on publication of cohort Year 6-9 OP results in EHP  
Date: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 10:21:13 AM

Exemption 6

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thu, Jun 2, 2011 11:13 am  
Subject: Re: Congratulations on publication of cohort Year 6-9 OP results in EHP

Exemption 6

please print for me a few of the media articles tx

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thu, Jun 2, 2011 9:35 am  
Subject: Re: Congratulations on publication of cohort Year 6-9 OP results in EHP

Exemption 6

Here are the media responses:

[http://www.m.sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/73206/title/Pesticides\\_tied\\_to\\_lower\\_IQ\\_in\\_children](http://www.m.sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/73206/title/Pesticides_tied_to_lower_IQ_in_children)  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-1379245/Pesticide-exposure-womb-linked-lower-IQ-children.html>  
<http://weil.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/21/pesticide-exposure-in-womb-affects-i-q/>  
<http://www.npr.org/2011/04/21/135605139/mothers-pesticide-exposure-linked-to-kids-iqs>  
[http://www.sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/73370/title/Because\\_some\\_foods\\_carry\\_organophosphate\\_residues](http://www.sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/73370/title/Because_some_foods_carry_organophosphate_residues)  
<http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-world/studies-link-low-iq-to-prenatal-pesticide-exposure-20110421-1dq0n.html>  
<http://yourlife.usatoday.com/parenting-family/pregnancy/story/2011/04/Children-exposed-to-high-pesticide-levels-in-the-womb-have-lower-iqs-new-studies-show/46340432/1>  
<http://healthland.time.com/2011/04/21/exposure-to-pesticides-in-pregnancy-can-lower-childrens-iq/>  
<http://www.latimes.com/health/boostershots/la-heb-pesticide-children-20110421.0.495683.story>  
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/04/21/us-pesticides-babies-idUSTRE73K0VE20110421>

This piece isn't specifically on Engel's study, but focus on the same subject and refer to Dr. Eskenazi and her study.

<http://www.ice.org/shows/segments.html?programID=11-P13-00016&segmentID=1>

On Thu, Jun 2, 2011 at 9:12 AM, Adam Medoff [REDACTED] wrote:  
Ok, here's the article. Landrigan didn't write it, which caused the confusion.

Exemption 6

<http://ehp03.niehs.nih.gov/article/info:doi/10.1289/ehp.1003183>

missing from  
original response.

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Fwd: Clarkson lunch  
Date: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 10:34:42 AM

Exempt 6

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
To: William Vitek <William.Vitek@williams.edu>  
Sent: Thu, Sep 9, 2010 12:48 pm  
Subject: Re: Clarkson lunch

Exempt 6

i'm in binghamton on monday.

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Vitek <William.Vitek@williams.edu>  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thu, Sep 9, 2010 10:34 am  
Subject: Re: Clarkson lunch

Exempt 6

Page 1 of this email chain  
was included in the  
original response, but page  
2 was missing

as more than

----- Original message -----

>Date: Sun, 5 Sep 2010 18:52:10 EDT  
>From: [REDACTED]  
>Subject: happy new year  
>To: [REDACTED]  
>Cc: wasserman@rffund.org, [REDACTED], William.Vitek@williams.edu

Exempt 6

> Great to see all of you! Bill, good luck in this  
> next chapter in your life. Betsy, good luck with the

> upcoming chapters of your book. [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED] cheers, Judith

Continuation of email

dated 5 Sept 5, 2010

Non-responsive